

REMARKS

Claims 21-26 and 28-30 and 32-45 are pending in the case. The Examiner rejected claims 21-45 and 48 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner further rejected claims 21-45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over cited prior art. Claims 21, 22, 28, 29, 34 and 41 have been amended. Claims 31 and 48 have been cancelled. The following remarks are considered by applicant to overcome each of the Examiner's outstanding rejections. An early Notice of Allowance therefore requested.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone conference on February 14, 2012 wherein the Examiner and the Applicant's attorney discussed claim 21 and the distinctions that exist between the invention and conventional tunneling mechanisms.

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-45 and 48 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that the specification states that the host device is authenticated to the target computer and that the claim that recites that the connection of the client system to the target network via the host without needing to authenticate the host system to the target system is not supported. While the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner, claim 48, which recited this feature has now been canceled. No other claim describes this authentication feature. Consequently, this basis for rejected claims 21-45 based on this reason is traversed.

The Examiner has also indicated the specification does not provide support for the limitation of "wherein said client software is prevented from accessing resources outside of the tunnel in the host system." Applicant has amended claim 21 to clarify the nature of the invention. In particular, claim 21 has been amended to specify that there exists application software on both the client and host that have been provided to each as both are members of a cooperative networking group. The software on the client is configured to identify the client as a member of the cooperative networking group. Once so configured, the software on the host will be able to recognize the client and will communicate with it. Claim 21 also recites that the host system has low level resources that allow it to communicate with the target network. Once the client system has been identified as a member of the cooperative networking group, the host system can provide the secure tunnel in the host system via the low level communication resources that already exist in the host system. Since all of the communication from the client system will be

directed to that software on the host and the host application software has been configured to ensure that the communication do not access other resources of the host system, the invented system implements a preventative secure system for the host system by controlling the application software on both the client and the host systems. The provision of the security is not a low level security feature, but one implemented by the host application software as it is directly in control of the communication received from the client system. As such, the specification provides support in the following specification sections: (1) On page 7, the summary of the invention section, (2) pages 13, last paragraph- page 14, all, (3) pages 17-18 and (4) Fig. 6. Fig. 6 shows that the (a) CTA exists on both the client system and the host system, (b) the host computer has been pre-configured to direct all physical links to the CTA (page 14) and (c) the CTA will utilize port 80 when connecting to the Internet. Through these measures, the system guarantees that all control of the communication from the client to the Internet is controlled by the software provided. As such, applicant contends that this rejection is traversed.

The Examiner further indicated that claim 31 that recited providing time divided channels for transmitting data was not supported. Claim 31 has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-45 and 48 under 35 USC 102 and being anticipated by Rai (US 6,377,982). Claim 21 has been substantially amended to clarify the nature of the invention. Claim 21 now recites to a complete system that specifies (1) that the application software provided on the client is configured to identify it as a member of a cooperative networking group, (2) that the host system has matching application software that is configured to communicate with the now identified client system, (3) that the host system has low level resources by which a tunnel to the target network is created and (4) that the application software on the host system will ensure the security of the host system's resources by ensuring that the client system does not access any resources outside of the low level resources used to access the target network. This is different from Rai. Rai is directed mainly to describing conventional tunneling system. The creation of a tunnel through a host is what is referred to in claim 21 as the low level resources. The applicant's invention is not directed to the physical creation of the communication tunnel, but the implementation of a system whereby the low level tunnel is created, used and secured by a higher level application software that is in communication with a client system. Such a system is not described in the currently cited prior art. As such, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claims 22-26, 28-30 and 31-45 are dependent claims on claim 21 and should be allowable for the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt notice to that affect are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 18, 2012

Stephen M. Chin
Reg. No. 39,938
Attorney For Applicants
von Simson & Chin LLP
62 William Street – Sixth Floor
New York, New York 10005
ph (212) 514-8645
direct dial (212) 514-8653
fax (212) 514-8648
smc@vsandc.com